AN

ADDRESS

TO THE

INHABITANTS

OF

GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND;

IN

REPLY to the PRINCIPLES

OF THE

Author of the Rights of Man.

Written in 1792.

Let us cheriſh and improve our ancient Government as much as poſſible, without encouraging a Paſſion for dangerous Novelties.

HUME.

London;

PRINTED FOR J. MATHEWS, N°. 18, STRAND;
J. SEWEL, CORNHILL; J. STOCKDALE, PICCADILLY;
MESS. HOOKHAMS, NEW BOND STREET;
AND
MESS. SHEPPERSON AND REYNOLDS, OXFORD STREET.

1793.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE

FOLLOWING PAGES

ARE

MOST RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED,

TO

THE MEMBERS

OF THE

SEVERAL ASSOCIATIONS

IN FAVOUR

OF

GOVERNMENT,

WHO

THEREBY MANIFEST THEIR

PATRIOTISM.

AS the AUTHOR of the ADDRESS, &c. did not ſuperintend the Printing thereof, he requeſts the Reader to make the following Corrections:

Page	line	For	Read
12	8	*they,*	*that they.*
15	12	*charters,*	*character.*
21	18	*uncoarſely,*	*unwarily.*
29	15, 16	*repoſitory,*	*depoſitary.*
30	24	*this,*	*his.*
31	2	*is,*	*it is.*
37	24	*ſhould,*	*may.*
41	3	*Abriam,*	*Abiram.*
45	7	*Fench,*	*French.*
47	16	*but alſo,*	*but alſo of.*

AN

ADDRESS, &c.

THE ferment which various parts of Europe have experienced and do at preſent, exhibits not only a large but melancholy ſcope for reflection, and more particularly when we caſt our eyes on the convulſed ſtate of a neighbouring kingdom, whoſe deſpotic ſyſtem has in a ſhort period been ſubverted by the democratic—To this particular circumſtance, we are indebted to Mr. Burke for his Reflections on the French Revolution, of which work, I am inclined to think, that if the advantages of education, a great natural genius for reaſoning and philoſophic experience are requiſites to accompliſh ſuch an undertaking, I may venture to pronounce, that

 they

they are ſo happily combined in the above production, that it merits to be conſidered as one of the moſt eloquent pieces of compoſition in the Engliſh language.

The avidity with which the Reflections on the French Revolution has been read, and the encreaſe of reputation it has ſecured to its Author, has ſtimulated a multiplicity of inferior writers to attempt a refutation thereof, and more particularly from that body of men who in a late ſeſſion of parliament ſolicited a repeal of the teſt and corporation acts; yet notwithſtanding the numerouſneſs of Mr. Burke's opponents, their efforts have been attended with very little ſucceſs, and ſeemingly conſcious of their own inability, they readily countenanced and embraced the doctrines of a political champion who promulgates his republican principles under the title of "*The Rights of Man*," a work, the tendency of which I conceive to be ſeditious, and in all probability the moſt audacious libel that ever was publiſhed. Here I cannot avoid remarking, that previous to the publication made by Mr. Burke, the ſubject thereof was agitated in the Britiſh Senate, and was productive of great warmth of temper,

betwixt

betwixt ſome of its principal ſpeakers—for my own part, I muſt candidly confeſs, it appeared to me a premature diſcuſſion, and that our Senators would have exhibited a more ſtriking proof of their wiſdom, in waiting the event of maturity or annihilation, before they had attempted, either to ſpeak or write on the ſubject.

But ſince it has proved otherwiſe, conſidering it the duty of every good citizen to offer his mite towards preſerving the peace and order of that government, the benefits of which he happily participates, the Writer takes the liberty of ſubmitting to public conſideration, a few remarks on Mr. Paine's Rights of Man, hoping they will operate as an antidote againſt the viſionary ſchemes of that writer, and contribute towards ſilencing his advocates.

The inattention of Mr. Burke to a ſuggeſtion of Mr. Paine's, ſo mortified his ambition and vanity, that he commences his Rights of Man, with a virulent attack on Mr. Burke's principles, and attempts to expoſe and ridicule his ſentiments by aſſuming a dictatorial authority. And in order to ſupport his puſillanimous ideas

of the Rights of Man, he adopts three principles, namely, That of aſſerting that the Engliſh have no conſtitution; That of oppoſing the law of hereditary right; and That of abuſing the Houſe of Brunſwick in the moſt illiberal manner.

An ingenious writer, ſpeaking of England, well obſerves, It's ſituation defends it from the ſudden inroads of foreign enemies, it's naval ſtrength from the more deliberate devaſtations of naval ſtrength, and the excellency of it's laws from the yet ſeverer outrages of arbitrary power—In order to enforce which I ſhall ſubjoin the ſentiments of a writer on the Engliſh government, who thus emphatically and explicitly expreſſes himſelf—" As to the government of England, it would be impertinent to praiſe it, all mankind allow it to be a maſter piece of human wiſdom. It has the advantages of every other form, with as little of their inconveniences as the imperfection attendant on all human inventions will admit; it has the monarchic quickneſs of execution and ſtability; the ariſtocratic diffuſive ſtrength and wiſdom of counſel; the democratic freedom, and equal diſtribution of property. When I mention

equal

equal diſtribution of property, I would not be underſtood to mean ſuch an equality as never exiſted, nor can exiſt, but in idea; but that general, that comparative equality, which leaves to every man the abſolute and ſafe poſſeſſion of the fruits of his labours; which ſoftens offenſive diſtinctions and curbs pride, by leaving every order of men in ſome degree dependant on each other; and admits of thoſe gentle and almoſt imperceptible gradations, which the poet ſo well calls

Th' according muſic of a well-mix'd ſtate.

The Prince is here a centre of union; an advantage, the want of which makes a democracy; which is ſo beautiful in theory, but the worſt of all poſſible governments, except abſolute monarchy in practice."

Apprehending theſe quotations have truth for their baſis, it muſt be admitted, that they are unequivocally in direct oppoſition to thoſe ſubverters of order, who (either ignorantly or wantonly) ſupport the erroneous principles contained in the Rights of Man.

Mr. Paine, with an effrontery peculiar to deſperate men, in p. 54 boldly aſſerts, that no ſuch thing as a conſtitution exiſts in England, or ever did, conſequently the people have one to form. Since Mr. Paine's ideas by no means coincides with thoſe of the preſent writer, he refers the queſtion to that great lexicographer Dr. Johnſon, who thus explains the word conſtitution.

The conſtitution politic, is the act of conſtituting, enacting, eſtabliſhing. And again,

That it is the eſtabliſhed form of government and ſyſtem of laws and cuſtoms.

That this is an accurate explanation, I ſhall not heſitate to admit, but leaſt it ſhould ſtand in need of aid, I conſider it neceſſary to introduce a curſory view of the Hiſtory of England, wherein I flatter myſelf that the diſpaſſionate and attentive reader, will not only find a few traits of a conſtitution, but alſo diſcover its regular progreſſion.

The

The inhabitants of the Britiſh Iſles were a people called Britons, of the ſame ſtock with the ancient Gauls or Celtæ; about half a century, before Chriſt, they were invaded by Julius Cæſar, and the Romans having ſubdued many provinces under Claudius, completed the conqueſt thereof under Domitian and maintained their authority for four centuries; early in the fifth century, the antient inhabitants called in the Saxons to aſſiſt them againſt the Picts and Scots, which ſuccours made a ſecond conqueſt, and the Saxons divided South Britain into ſeven kingdoms, which form of government was called the Heptarchy for four centuries; but early in the ninth, it was annihilated by Egbert, who having ſubdued the neighbouring princes, united them in his own perſon, and was crowned *King of England.* In about half a century, England was conquered by the Danes, but recovered by Alfred in 880; however, until the Saxon line was reſtored in the perſon of Edward the Confeſſor, owing to the puſillanimity of ſome princes, and the folly of others, it was for above a century and a half, a ſcene of bloodſhed and cruelty, from the frequent incurſions of the Danes. So early as

the eighth century we find a code of laws made by Ina King of the Weſt Saxons. In the ninth, Alfred formed a body of laws, which is eſteemed the origin of common law; and about the middle of the eleventh century Edward the Confeſſor cauſed the Saxon laws and cuſtoms to be reviſed and amended, and formed into one body. On William I. coming to the throne by conqueſt, he ſubverted the antient fabric of the Saxon legiſlation; however, Henry I. reſtored it, by the charter of rights and privileges granted in 1100, which charter was the baſis of Magna Charta granted by King John in 1215, and renewed and ratified by Henry III. in 1258.

Under Henry II. liberty took a further ſtride, and trial by jury, which is one of the moſt valuable parts of the Engliſh law, after long laying dormant, re-appeared: for if we conſult Lambarde's Irenarchia, we ſhall find this mode of trial of as early a date as the Saxon Heptarchy.

The exceſſive power which William and his ſucceſſors aſſumed, cauſing a union between the barons and people at large, produced

duced that ſpirit of reſiſtance which has ſecured to us the baſis of our conſtitution, and at the cloſe of King John's reign, conſervators of the public liberties were choſen from among the barons to circumſcribe the regal power. Towards the latter end of the 13th century, in the reign of Edward 1ſt, the firſt regular parliament was held, and there has been a conſtant ſucceſſion, except during the civil war. By Magna Charta the rights and privileges of the individual, as well in his perſon as his property, became ſettled axioms; which charter enacted with much ſolemnity, and confirmed at the commencement of every ſucceeding reign, became like a general banner perpetually ſet up for the union of all claſſes of people, to whom it always has and always muſt appear, an admirable foundation for thoſe equitable laws to riſe from, which offer the ſame aſſiſtance to the poor and weak, as to the rich and powerful. In Edward the firſt's reign, it was decreed that no tax ſhould be laid, nor impoſt levied, without the joint conſent of Lords and Commons; which important ſtatute in conjunction with the great charter, ſurely not only proves the exiſtence of a conſtitution, but alſo its increaſing vigour. If as

a learned

a learned advocate well obſerves, That from the latter the Engliſh are to date the origin of their liberty, from the former they are to date the eſtabliſhment of it; and as the great charter was the bulwark that protected the freedom of individuals, ſo was the ſtatute in queſtion the engine which protected the charter itſelf, and by the help of which, the people were thenceforth to make legal conqueſts over the power of the crown. Society at large becoming legiſlators through the medium of their delegates, gained that point which was to procure them that great influence they at preſent poſſeſs, and the ſubſequent reigns furniſh us with various inſtances of it's growth. Under Edward the ſecond, the legiſlative authority of the Commons was very conſpicuous, when they began to annex petitions to the bills by which they granted ſubſidies. Under Edward the third, they acknowledged no law but what they aſſented to; and ſoon after ſenſible of their own importance, they exerted a privilege in which conſiſts one of the great balances of the conſtitution, that of impeaching ſome of the firſt miniſters of ſtate. Under Henry the fourth, they refuſed to grant ſubſidies, before an anſwer had been given to their petitions;

tions; in a word, every event of any conſequence, was attended with an increaſe of the power of the Commons, which though ſlow and gradual were peaceably and legally effected; conſequently, more likely to engage the attention of the people, and coaleſce with the antient principles of the conſtitution.

During the reigns of Henry V. and VI. what with our wars with France, and the contention between the houſes of York and Lancaſter, England exhibited a melancholy ſpectacle, and the laws were greatly neglected. However, the conteſt betwixt the houſes of York and Lancaſter, being terminated in the perſon of Henry the ſeventh, the long and violent agitation which England had laboured under, was to be followed by a long and painful recovery. Henry aſcending the throne ſword in hand, and in great meaſure as a conqueror, had promiſes to fulfill as well as injuries to avenge. The time ſeemed to be arrived, at which England was doomed to ſubmit to the fate of other nations; thoſe barriers which it had raiſed for the defence of it's liberty, ſeemed to have only been able to poſtpone the inevitable effects of power. But the

remembrance

remembrance of their antient laws was too deeply impreſſed on their minds to be effaced by tranſitory evils. Like a deep and extenſive ocean which preſerves an equability of temperature amidſt all the viciſſitudes of ſeaſons, the ſubjects of the Engliſh government retained thoſe principles of liberty ſo univerſally diffuſed, they required only a proper opportunity to manifeſt themſelves. The tyrannical laws of Henry the eighth againſt high-treaſon, were aboliſhed by his virtuous ſucceſſor Edward the ſixth, who having reigned ſix years, was ſucceeded by the blood-thirſty Mary; but it was a happy circumſtance for England, that ſhe reigned only five years, and was ſucceeded by Elizabeth, whoſe reign was long and brilliant. Under her England revived, and the Proteſtant religion was cheriſhed. It was not until her reign that the government of England came to an equal balance, which is the true perfection of it. The aſſembly of the people under the Saxons, was more properly a diet than a parliament; all the freemen had a right to be there, but how far they had a right to vote in it is uncertain. It is probable, that in moſt affairs they were determined by the advice or authority of the principal or leading men.

men. After the invaſion of the Normans, theſe aſſemblies ſeldom met, and by degrees wholly loſt their former ſhape; the Commons were no longer preſent in them, and when afterwards they came thither by deputation (not promiſcuouſly as before) the people were no great gainers by it, for the whole ſtrength of the government reſided in the barons and the clergy, who did as they pleaſed. The proceedings of the Commons could not be free in their repreſentative body, while they were feeble and oppreſt in their collective. The laws of vaſſalage and immunities of the church hung heavy on them, and prevented their acting with vigour. Without the nobles and clergy on their ſide, they durſt refuſe nothing to the crown; and ſo ſtrong was dependency upon them, that we find in moſt of the civil-wars they blindly followed the paſſions of both, and made or unmade kings as they directed. But in return for their ſervices they got their liberties confirmed, and many of their grievances redreſſed; they revenged themſelves on the miniſters that oppreſſed them, and made good laws for the common-wealth. Nor indeed, did any parliament freely choſen, ever conſent to eſtabliſh

ſlavery

ſlavery by law, but their right continued always unretracted, though weakly maintained. Such was the condition of the houſe of Commons for many centuries; and that it was able to ſupport itſelf under ſo many diſadvantages, ſhews a great natural ſtrength in it's conſtitution. That ſtrength was exerted by degrees, it's privileges were conſiderably enlarged, and it became in fact, as well as name, a third branch of the legiſlature. The laws of vaſſalage were broken through, the eſtates of the nobles were made alienable, the weight of property was transferred to the ſide of the people. Many accidents concurred to the ſame effect. A reformation in religion was begun, by which that mighty fabric church-power, erected on the ruins of public liberty, and adorned with the ſpoils of the crown itſelf, was happily attacked and overturned. The immenſe poſſeſſions of the clergy were taken from them, and beſtowed upon the Commons; they had now the greateſt ſhare of the lands of England, and a ſtill greater ſhare in it's commerce, which they were beginning to extend and improve. Their riches ſecured their independence, the clergy feared them, and the nobles could not hurt them. In this ſtate

Elizabeth

Elizabeth found the parliament; the Lords and Commons were nigh upon a level, and the church in a decent ſubordination. She had ſkill enough to give to each it's proper weight and yet maintain her own authority; ſhe was the head of this well proportioned body, and wiſely directed all it's motions; thus what in mixed forms of government ſeldom happens, there was no conteſt in the legiſlature, becauſe no part was ſo high as to be uncontrouled; or ſo low, as to be oppreſſed.

Very different was the charters and conduct of her ſucceſſor James I. who endeavoured to deſtroy the balance of government, by her ſo wiſely fixed, by ſtruggling with his ſubjects for power, without one quality that could enſure him ſucceſs; for he poſſeſſed neither courage, ability or addreſs; was contemned both at home and abroad; and even his favourites did not love him, though he ſacrificed every thing to them. By maintaining that the power of kings was not controulable any more than that of God; by aſſerting that thoſe privileges which the people laid claim to ſo clamorouſly as their inheritance and birth-right, were no more than an effect of the grace and toleration

of

of his royal anceſtors; and by the clergy ecchoing from the pulpit his notions of divine right—a general alarm took place, and it was natural on the promulgation of ſuch tyrannic principles. Although thoſe inſtruments of tyranny, the unconſtitutional court of the ſtar chamber, and the inquiſitorial tribunal of the high commiſſion exiſted under Elizabeth, they were reſerved for James I. to make an oſtentatious diſplay of what his predeceſſor had been contented to enjoy.

The ſcene which opened to view on the acceſſion of his ſon Charles I. preſented the moſt formidable aſpect. The notions of religion by a ſingular concurrence, united with the love of liberty; the ſame ſpirit which had made an attack on the eſtabliſhed faith, now directed itſelf to politics. The royal prerogatives underwent the ſame examination, as the doctrines of the church of Rome had; and as a ſuperſtitious religion appeared unable to ſupport the teſt, neither could an authority pretended unlimited be expected to bear it. Charles I. had many better qualities than his father, but as wrong a judgment and greater obſtinacy. He carried his affection for the clergy, and abhorrence

horſence of the puritans to an exceſs of bigotry and rage; he agreed ſo ill with his parliaments that he grew weary of them, and called none for ſeveral years, during which interval he was a deſpot. The laws were either openly infringed, or explained as he directed, and he levied money upon his ſubjects againſt privileges expreſsly confirmed by himſelf. In ſhort, his paſſion for power, might have been fully gratified, if his more prevailing one to bigotry had not engaged him in a ſenſeleſs undertaking of forcing the form of worſhip upon his ſubjects in Scotland, as he had declared himſelf ſo warmly for in England. It is eaſier to attack men in their civil rights, than their religious opinions: the Scots who had acquieſced under tyranny, took up arms againſt perſecution. Their inſurrection rendered a parliament neceſſary, and although one was called, it was diſſolved by the intemperate folly of the court. All hopes of better meaſures were put an end to by this laſt provocation. The Scots marched into England and were received not as enemies, but as brothers and allies; the King unable to oppoſe them, was compelled to aſk the aid of another parliament. A parliament met, inflamed with the oppreſſions

of fifteen years, and it's principal members were men, whom the neceſſity and danger of the times had rendered equally able and determined; and accordingly, they embraced the opportunity, to redreſs their grievances and ſecure their liberty; it was they that abridged the royal prerogative, by the famous act, entitled the Petition of Rights; it was they, that declared the levying of ſhip-money by virtue of the royal prerogative, contrary to the laws of the realm, and the petition of rights; it was they, that aboliſhed the court of ſtar chamber, and extended the Habeas Corpus act to all caſes bailable by law, which laſt act was made more general and effectual for ſecuring the liberty of the ſubject under Charles the ſecond. By theſe wiſe meaſures the conſtitution was freed from the apparatus of deſpotic power, with which the tudors had obſcured it.

On the death of Charles the firſt, a private man, whoſe genius called forth by the troubles of his country, and formed in the exerciſe of faction, uſurped the government. His character was as extraordinary as his fortune, he was enthuſiaſt enough to be agreeable to the humour of the times, and yet ſenſible enough

to

to govern his enthuſiaſm by the rules of prudence. He trampled on the laws of the nation, but he raiſed the glory of it. At his death, all order was loſt in the ſtate, various tyrannies were ſet up, and deſtroyed each other; this attempt to eſtabliſh a republican government producing anarchy and confuſion, convinced the nation that an endeavour to eſtabliſh liberty, by making the people interfere in the common buſineſs of government, is of all attempts the moſt chimerical; that the authority of all, with which men are amuſed, is in reality no more than the authority of a few powerful individuals, who divide the republic among themſelves; therefore, at laſt, they reſted in the boſom of the only conſtitution, which is fit for a great ſtate and a free people, I mean, that, in which a choſen number deliberate, and a ſingle hand executes. On this principle, Charles the ſecond was reſtored, but unfortunately his ideas of the prerogative being as great as thoſe of his predeceſſors, the parliament from time to time framed ſuch laws as they conceived neceſſary to convince him, that he was the diſpenſer of the law, and not the fabricator of it. James the ſecond, his brother and ſucceſſor, not content with indul-

ging the ſame high notions, added to the ſpirit of tyranny that of bigotry. His declarations held forth the doctrine of abſolute power and unlimited obedience; he aſſumed a right to diſpenſe with the laws, and becauſe the judges pronounced it illegal, he diſmiſſed them; to which enormities may be added, his endeavour to aboliſh proteſtantiſm, in order to eſtabliſh on its ruins that mode of faith, which repeated acts of the legiſlature had proſcribed. Such conduct being a direct breach of this coronation oath, the people withdrew their allegiance, conceiving themſelves abſolved from their oath to a King who had violated that which he had made to his people. Having thus broken the ties which bound the people to the throne, they no longer conſidered him as their monarch, and he ſenſible thereof, ſought an aſylum in a foreign land. The throne being declared vacant, a convention was held, which took care to repair the breaches that had been made in the conſtitution, as well as to prevent new ones; on this event, an oath was required of the new King in ſtronger and more binding terms, than that taken by his predeceſſors. It was determined that to impoſe taxes without the conſent of parliament,

as

as well as keep up a ſtanding army in time of peace, are contrary to law, and the power which the crown had conſtantly claimed of diſpenſing with the laws, was aboliſhed. On this occaſion, the ſubject without diſtinction obtained the privilege of petitioning the King, and the conſtitution, was eſtabliſhed by that famous act intitled the Bill of Rights, which declared the rights and liberties of the ſubject, and ſettled the ſucceſſion of the crown. Which act is the laſt and greateſt bulwark of the Britiſh freedom, for it is a covenant between the people and their ſovereign, ſo much the more binding and irrefragable, as it is founded on a true ſenſe of their mutual intereſts, and admits of no pretence on either ſide, of having been forcibly impoſed, or uncoarſely accepted.

From this brief review of Engliſh hiſtory, it appears evident to the writer, that the legiſlative power of parliament, is that of abrogating, amending or explaining its laws; if ſo, and our delegates have from time to time diſcharged the important duty conferred on them, ſure none but the intemperate and ſeditious can deny the exiſtence of a conſtitution, but

muſt ingenuouſly confeſs it's regular progreſſion is evident. Having cloſed my review of Engliſh hiſtory, ſhall proceed to point out various obnoxious paſſages in the Rights of Man, to which I ſhall ſubjoin a few remarks, and although they may not appear brilliant, ſhall wiſh them to be conſidered as the effuſions of a good ſubject.

Such is Mr. Paine's regard for the political creed of Dr. Price, whom he calls one of the beſt hearted men that lives, and whoſe political ſermon Mr. Burke juſtly reprobates. Such is his regard, I ſay, for this political prieſt, that he implicitly adopts his principles, and in his own language aſſerts, that the community obtained three advantages by means of the revolution, namely,

To chuſe their own governors,
To caſhier them for miſconduct,
To frame a government for themſelves.

Were men equally intelligent, probably the above poſitions might not be liable to exception, but ſince that is not the caſe, they open a door to perſons diſaffected, to draw ſuch indirect concluſions therefrom, as may

tend to influence the minds of the inferior claſſes of ſociety, to the mutual prejudice of the governed and governors.

The feeble attempt which Mr. Paine has made to perſuade us that we have no conſtitution, I apprehend is fully anſwered in our review of Engliſh hiſtory, but in addition thereto, I ſhall point out the peculiar ſtability of the executive part of the Britiſh crown, and the advantages that reſult therefrom in favor of public liberty, namely: The numerous reſtraints the governing authority is able to bear, and extenſive freedom it can afford to allow the ſubject. The liberty of ſpeaking and writing to the great extent it is in England. The unbounded freedom of debate in the legiſlature. The power to bear the conſtant union of all orders of ſubjects againſt it's prerogative. The freedom allowed to all individuals to take an active part in government concerns. The ſtrict impartiality with which juſtice is dealt to all ſubjects without any reſpect whatever of perſons. The lenity of the criminal law, both in regard to the mildneſs of puniſhments, and the frequent remitting of them. The ſtrict compliance of the go-

verning authority with the letter of the law. The needleſſneſs of an armed force to ſupport itſelf by, and as a conſequence, the ſingular ſubjection of the military to the civil power.

" Theſe advantages" ſays Monſ. De Lolme, " are peculiar to the Engliſh government, to attempt to imitate them or transfer them into other countries with that degree of extent to which they are carried in England, without at the ſame time transferring the whole order of conjunction of circumſtances in the Engliſh government, would prove unſucceſsful. The remarkable ſolidity of the governing executive authority in England, operates to the advantage of the people in a two-fold manner. In the firſt place, it takes from the nobles and great men, all ſerious ambition to invade this authority, thereby preventing thoſe anarchical and bloody ſtruggles to reſult from their debates, which have ſo conſtantly diſturbed other countries. And in the ſecond place, it inſpires thoſe great men with that ſalutary jealouſy of the ſame authority, which leads them to frame ſuch effectual proviſions for laying it under proper reſtraint. The power of crowns in other monarchies, has not been able by itſelf,

to

to produce the ſame effects it has in England, that is, it has not been able to inſpire the great men in the ſtate with any thing like that ſalutary jealouſy we mention, nor of courſe to induce them to unite with the people in the common cauſe. Notwithſtanding various attempts have been made at different periods to ſubvert the Engliſh conſtitution, yet theſe ſtruggles, by ſome means or other, have always found, and I truſt always will, a proportionate degree of re-action, new difficulties, and at laſt inſuperable impediments grow up in the way of thoſe who would take advantage of the general ferment, to raiſe themſelves on the wreck of the governing authority: a ſecret force exerts itſelf, which gradually reſtores things to a ſtate of moderation and calm, and that ſea ſo ſtormy, to appearance ſo deeply agitated, conſtantly ſtops at certain limits, which it ſeems as if it wanted the power to paſs. Let ſuch as are jealous of the power of the crown, recollect, that the government of England conſiſts of three component parts; the conſequence of which is, the conſtitution cannot be ſubverted by the regal power; for though the King has the prerogative of commanding armies, and equipping fleets; without

out the concurrence of parliament he cannot maintain them. Although he can beſtow places and employments, without the aſſiſtance of parliament, he cannot fulfill his engagements. And, although he can declare war, without the aſſent and proviſion of parliament, he cannot carry it on.

The Engliſh conſtitution being different from that of all other free ſtates, it cannot fall to ruin from the ſame cauſes, which Monſ. De Lolme puts in a clear point of view in his xviith chapter of the 2d book of his moſt excellent work on the conſtitution of England, at the ſame time noticing various circumſtances that operate for it's preſervation; and in the four firſt chapters of the 2d book, he demonſtrates the ſuperiority of the Engliſh conſtitution, in preference to a republican ſyſtem. "Thoſe," ſays he, "who are acquainted with "republican governments, and the manner in "which buſineſs is tranſacted in numerous "aſſemblies, will not ſcruple to affirm, that "the few who are united together, who take "an active part in public affairs, and whoſe "ſtation makes them conſpicuous, have ſuch "an advantage over the many who turn their

"eyes

" eyes towards them, and are without union
" among themſelves, that even with the mid-
" degree of ſkill, they can at all times direct
" at pleaſure, the general reſolutions; that as
" a conſequence of the very nature of things,
" there is no propoſal, however abſurd, to
" which a numerous aſſembly may not, at one
" time or other, be brought to aſſent. In aſ-
" ſemblies like theſe, a confuſion is produced,
" which in all commonwealths have enabled
" the ambitious to carry on their ſchemes with
" ſafety; but the conſtitution of England hav-
" ing made all honors and places depend on
" the will of one man, has confined within
" private walls thoſe projects, the purſuit of
" which, in former times, ſhook the founda-
" tions of whole ſtates; it has changed into
" intrigues the conflicts, the outrages of am-
" bition, and thoſe contentions, which in the
" preſent times afford them only matter of
" amuſement, are the volcano's which ſet in
" flames the antient commonwealths." Thoſe who attentively peruſe the hiſtory of our country, will be particularly ſtruck with one circumſtance, whereby the Engliſh government demonſtrates it's ſuperiority over all other free governments; I mean the manner in which

revolutions

revolutions and public commotions have always been terminated in England; for if we look into the free ſtates, we muſt obſerve, that their public diſſenſions have always been terminated by ſettlements, in which, only the intereſts of a few were provided for, while the grievances of the many were hardly, if at all, attended to. But in England the very reverſe has happened, and we find revolutions always terminated by extenſive and accurate proviſions for ſecuring the general liberty, of which circumſtances, I truſt, our review of Engliſh hiſtory affords ample proof.

As the moving ſprings of the executive power are in the hands of the King, a kind of ſacred depoſitum, ſo are thoſe of the legiſlative power in the hands of the two houſes. The King muſt abſtain from touching them in the ſame manner as all his ſubjects are bound to ſubmit to his prerogatives. If the crown had been allowed to take an active part in the fabrication of laws, it would ſoon have rendered uſeleſs the other branches of legiſlature, but as this is not the caſe, our conſtitution can never be in danger from the regal prerogative.

When

When revolutions have happened, the greateſt care was taken to aſcertain the limits of the power wherewith the crown was to be inveſted, and on the reſtoration of peace, thoſe who remained at the head of affairs, exhibited an unwearied jealouſy in maintaining thoſe advantages, which the united efforts of all had obtained. The laws of England open no door to thoſe accumulations of power, which have been the ruin of ſo many republics, the ambitious cannot find in them the poſſible means of taking an advantage of the inadvertence, or even the gratitude of the people, to make themſelves tyrants; and that the public power, of which the prince is made the excluſive repoſitory, muſt remain unſhaken in his hands, ſo long as legal order is preſerved, is unqueſtionably a ſtrong inducement to him ſtrenuouſly to adhere thereto, for were he not, he would infringe his coronation oath.

If we compare the ſteadineſs of the Engliſh government with the continual ſubverſions of the laws of ſome antient republics, with the imprudence of ſome of the laws paſſed in their aſſemblies, and with the ſtill greater inconſiderateneſs

derateneſs with which they ſometimes repealed the moſt ſalutary regulations, if we call to mind the extraordinary means to which the legiſlature of thoſe republics, at times ſenſible, how it's very power was prejudicial to itſelf and the ſtate, was obliged to have recourſe, in order, if poſſible, to tie it's own hands, we ſhall remain convinced of the advantages derivable from our happy conſtitution.

The author of the Rights of Man is much diſguſted with the parliament of 1688, and Mr. Burke's juſtification of them in making the crown hereditary, he admits they had a temporary right, but none to anſwer for poſterity, therefore, he calls it an ASSUMPTION, and on this principle, in p. 82, he thus expreſſes himſelf. "As the eſtimation of all things is "by compariſon, the revolution of 1688, "however, from circumſtances it may have "been exalted beyond it's value, will find it's "level; it is already in the wane, eclipſed by "the enlarging orb of reaſon, and the lumi-"nous revolutions of America and France."

With reſpect to this aſſertion in p. 9. "That there never did, nor never can exiſt "a parliament

" a parliament that can controul poſterity to " the end of time," is a manifeſt abſurdity, for he cannot deny that in this our day there are many acts in full force, which have exiſted many centuries, and will unqueſtionably in that ſenſe remain to the end of time, unleſs the ſenate ſhall in their wiſdom deem it neceſſary either to repeal or amend them.—Much has been ſaid in favour of a publication called Common Senſe, but ſurely none but an intriguing republican would have attempted to inſinuate that Mr. Burke meant to imply, that it was not in the power of parliament to make ſuch alterations and amendments, as the circumſtances of the times might render neceſſary; was the fact as inſiduouſly urged by Mr. Paine, in order to influence the credulous and uninformed, England, inſtead of being bleſſed with ſuch a conſtitution as it enjoys, would in all probability have groaned under a deſpotic yoke; and as it was of late in France, inſtead of the power of framing and repealing laws, being veſted in the ſenate, they would only have been called together as the wants of the prince might find neceſſary, not for the purpoſe of deliberation, but to regiſter the edicts of a deſpot.

In

In cenſuring the parliament of 1688, for making the crown hereditary, ſurely Mr. Paine is guilty of a groſs error, for no evil conſequence could ariſe therefrom, much good probably might, and actually has, in preventing contentions on that head. In making the crown hereditary, the parliament did not ſurrender to it their rights and privileges, which is clearly demonſtrated by the declaration they made under the title of the Bill of Rights. Admitting this to be a fact, which I truſt is irrefutable, what reaſon can be offered for demurring againſt hereditary right, for my part I can diſcover no other motive, than a wanton deſire to abuſe William the third, and the preſent family.

In p. 131, he ſays, if government be what Mr. Burke deſcribes, a contrivance of human wiſdom, I might aſk him, if wiſdom was at ſuch a low ebb in England, that it was become neceſſary to import it from Holland and Hanover? But I will do the country the juſtice to ſay, that was not the caſe, and even if it was, it miſtook the cargo. In p. 133 he ſays, he cannot conceive why the people of

England

England ſent for George the firſt, and that it would puzzle a wiſer man than Mr. Burke, to diſcover for what he could be wanted, or what ſervice he could render. In p. 134 theſe are his words, "The Engliſh may wiſh ſucceſs to the principles of liberty, but a German elector trembles for the fate of deſpotiſm in his electorate, and the duchy of Mechlenburgh, where the preſent Queen's family governs, is under the ſame wretched ſtate of arbitrary power, and the people in ſlaviſh vaſſalage." Again, in p. 135, his language runs thus, "George the firſt and ſecond were ſenſible of a rival in the remains of the Stuarts, and as they could not but conſider themſelves as ſtanding on their good behaviour, they had prudence enough to keep their German principles of government to themſelves, but as the Stuart family wore away, the prudence became leſs neceſſary."

Theſe are not the only invectives uſed by Mr. Paine againſt the preſent eſtabliſhment; the levelling principles of this writer are unbounded, he apparently conſiders himſelf, as the only man qualified to form ſyſtems of government, and cenſure at pleaſure, for had not this been the caſe, would he not have

allowed Mr. Burke the ſame privilege. It is very certain, that Mr. Burke's picture of the national aſſembly, is by no means a pleaſing one, and though it does not captivate, it does not follow, but it is a juſt one; nor becauſe it does not coincide with Mr. Paine's ideas, it does not juſtify his language in p. 5, wherein he ſays, there is ſcarcely an epithet of abuſe in the Engliſh language, with which Mr. Burke has not loaded the French nation, and the national aſſembly. Every thing which rancour, prejudice, ignorance, or knowledge could ſuggeſt, are poured forth in the copious fury of near four hundred pages. After making this declaration and thereby reprehending Mr. Burke as a writer, one could never have imagined Mr. Paine would have trod in a worſe path, did not the preceding paſſages from his Rights of Man, prove the fact. With reſpect to the levelling principles of this writer, our aſtoniſhment will abate, when we conſider that men are too much addicted to fall down and worſhip the fabrications of their own evil imaginations; the efforts that have been made to ſubjugate this country at various periods, have been ſubverted by the wiſe proviſions of parliament, whoſe power is eminently conſpicuous

ſpicuous in the coronation oath, wherein the Prince in the moſt ſolemn manner binds himſelf to govern according to the ſtatutes of parliament agreed on, and the laws and cuſtoms of the ſame. As this is an incontrovertible fact, what is there ſo odious in the word King, as to induce Mr. Paine in p. 131 to aſk, "What are thoſe men kept for?" in reply thereto, "Is not the King ſubject to the law, and not the law to him? Can he levy ſuch ſums as caprice ſuggeſts?" The anſwer to the firſt queſtion is Yes; to the latter, No; for the public ever jealous of the power of the crown, have wiſely veſted the ſole power of raiſing ſupplies in their repreſentatives, totally precluding the Houſe of Peers from interfering therein, any further, than by aſſenting thereto. Surely theſe circumſtances combined with thoſe already urged, ſtrongly indicate the exiſtence of a conſtitution: nevertheleſs, Mr. Paine, in p. 54, wantonly calls on Mr. Burke to produce the Engliſh conſtitution, and ſays, "though it has been ſo much talked "about, no ſuch thing as a conſtitution exiſts, "or ever did exiſt, and conſequently the peo-"ple have yet a conſtitution to form." If the contents of the preceding pages will ſerve

to controvert Mr. Paine's falſe principles, what then can be his motive for aſſerting that we have no conſtitution? For my part, as uncharitable as the inference may appear, I am inclined to ſuſpect, that the principles of this arch-revolution-monger has taken ſuch deep root, that he is become the father of ſedition, and ſpurns at repoſing in the lap of peace. And in this idea, I am ſupported, by his rapturous language, whenever ſpeaking of the American and French revolutions. Becauſe Mr. Burke reſts his evidence on the law of the land and refers thereto; Mr. Paine in his oracular wiſdom, reprobates the authority of muſty records and mouldy parchments, ſee p. 15, preferring thereto the ſublime republican principles of himſelf, and the Marquis de la Fayette. I would not be underſtood that the character of the latter is as contemptible as that of the former, being well perſuaded that he poſſeſſes many amiable qualities, and readily do I acquieſce with Mr. Paine, that the Marquis's farewell ſpeech to Congreſs did him great credit. "May this great monument raiſed to liberty, ſerve as a leſſon to the oppreſſor, and an example to the oppreſſed." But manly as this ſpeech was, the implication was peculiarly

culiarly emphatic, when we recollect that the ſpeaker was a Frenchman.

Mr. Burke ſays, " We have ſeen the " French rebel againſt a mild and lawful " monarch, with more fury, outrage and " inſult, than any people has been known to " riſe againſt the moſt illegal uſurper, or the " moſt ſanguinary tyrant." To which Mr. Paine, with an air of triumph, replies in p. 17, thus, " This is one among a thouſand other " inſtances, in which Mr. Burke ſhews that " he is ignorant of the ſprings and principles " of the French revolution." Inſtead of preſuming to doubt Mr. Paine's aſſertion, I readily give him credit for it, and am induced to think, had Mr. Paine been as ignorant as Mr. Burke, he would have appeared in a more amiable light than he does, but the factious principles he wiſhes to diſſemminate muſt excite diſguſt in the breaſt of every good ſubject, and provoke attachment to the preſent eſtabliſhment, which doubtleſs, will produce a union of ſentiment, that the violaters of its laws ſhould meet with their deſerts. Mr. Paine in p. 87 ſays, " as it was impoſſible " to ſeparate the military events which took

" place in America, from the principles of " the American revolution, the publication " of thoſe events in France, neceſſarily con- " nected themſelves with the principles that " produced them; many of the facts were " in themſelves principles, ſuch as the de- " claration of American independence, and " the treaty of alliance between France and " America, which recognized the natural " right of man, and juſtified reſiſtance to op- " preſſion." In this paſſage, Mr. Paine ingenuouſly confeſſes the ſource of the French revolution, as much as if he had ſaid, It was in America that the French army imbibed the principles of liberty, and reſolved to embrace the earlieſt opportunity to convince their ſovereign of his error, and to puniſh his perfidy, by eradicating deſpotiſm, and raiſing liberty on its ruins. But becauſe deſpotiſm prevailed in France, has Mr. Paine the leaſt right to infer that it does in England? ſurely not, unleſs by ſome ingenious piece of ſophiſtry he can reconcile jarring qualities, and clearly demonſtrate an abſolute and limited monarchy one and the ſame thing. But if he cannot, how has he miſapplied his talents in endeavouring to propagate doctrines of ſo dangerous a tendency.

Although Mr. Paine in p. 115 ſays, " Mr. " Burke's book is a mob of ideas tumbling " over and deſtroying one another," he muſt excuſe me ſaying, that the reflection he attempts to caſt on Mr. Burke, may with propriety be applied to himſelf; and ſince he has been pleaſed in p. 23, to pronounce Lord George Gordon a madman, I hope he will allow me the ſame liberty, and not take umbrage at my pronouncing him one, for certainly, none but a madman would have been guilty of promulgating ſuch ſeditious and inflammatory principles as the Rights of Man abounds with.

In p. 43, he ſays, " I have now to follow " Mr. Burke through a pathleſs wilderneſs of " rhapſodies, and a ſort of deſcant upon go- " vernments, in which he aſſerts whatever he " pleaſes, on the preſumption of it's being " believed, without offering either evidence or " reaſons for ſo doing." Suppoſing Mr. Paine's aſſertion literally true, is it not ſtrange, ſince in his own judgment, he conſiders himſelf qualified for a cenſor, that he ſhould fall into the ſame error, for how wild and extravagant

is his language, when he talks of the rights of man, and attempts to form ideas of government. In p. 45, he ſays, " Though I mean not to " touch upon any ſectarian principle of reli- " gion, yet it may be worth obſerving, that " the genealogy of Chriſt is traced to Adam. " Why then not trace the rights of man " to the creation of man? I will anſwer," ſays he, " the queſtion, becauſe there have " been an upſtart of governments, thruſting " themſelves between," and preſumptuouſly " working to unmake man;" and in order to ſtrengthen his opinion, in p. 46, he ſays, " The Moſaic account of the creation; whe- " ther taken as divine authority, or merely " hiſtorical, is full up to this point, *the unity* " *or equality of man.* The expreſſions admit " of no controverſy, And God ſaid, let us " make man in our own image, in the image of " God, created he him, male and female created " he them. The diſtinction of ſexes is pointed " out, but no other diſtinction is ever implied." From Mr. Paine's remarks on holy writ, he ſeems deſirous to impreſs an idea, that unleſs all mankind are on a level, the rights of man are invaded. For my part, inſtead of acquieſcing with Mr. Paine, I have ever conſidered ſubordination as eſſentially neceſſary for the preſervation

preſervation of order, conſequently the grand organiſer of ſociety. Was not Korah, Dathan, and Abriam, with their accomplices, ſwallowed up by the earth for conſpiring to diveſt Moſes and Aaron of the powers conferred on them by God? Has not the Saviour of mankind furniſhed us with exemplary inſtances of obedience? and does not St. Peter, who wrote ſeventeen centuries ſince, ſtrongly expreſs himſelf in favour of ſubordination, for in the 9th and 10th verſes of the iid chapter of his iid Epiſtle, after exhorting all Chriſtians to beware of falſe prophets and falſe teachers, he tells them, "That the Lord knoweth how to "deliver the ungodly out of temptations, and "to reſerve the unjuſt to the day of judgment "to be puniſhed—but chiefly them that walk "after the fleſh in the luſt of uncleanneſs, and "deſpiſe government, preſumptuous are they, "ſelf willed, they are not afraid to ſpeak evil "of dignities;" and St. Jude, the brother of St. James, and cotemporary of St. Peter, ſpeaking of the deſtruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, expreſsly ſays, "Vengeance will fall on thoſe "who deſpiſe dominion, and ſpeak evil of dig-"nities." St. Paul in his Epiſtle to Titus, the Grecian Biſhop, admoniſhes him in his iiid chapter,

ter, to put them in mind to be ſubject to principalities and powers, " To obey magiſ-" trates, to be ready to every good work;" and the ſame apoſtle, in the 17th verſe of his xiiith chapter to the Hebrews, ſtrongly recommends ſubmiſſion and obedience to them that have the rule over us. Here I might conſiderably enlarge, by calling to my aid innumerable paſſages of ſacred writ, but ſhall avoid ſo doing, from a conviction, that ſuch as wiſh to manifeſt their attachment to government and ſelf-welfare, will look up to the authority of the ſcriptures, and by a frequent peruſal of them, will not only become good citizens, but ſecure to themſelves a bleſſed eternity. From every period of hiſtory, whether ſacred or prophane, it is evident, that ſubordination is abſolutely neceſſary towards maintaining good order, conſequently largely contributes to the happineſs of ſociety, therefore cannot be diſpenſed with. Becauſe we cannot trace the word monarchy near ſix thouſand years, why in the name of goodneſs ſhould we quarrel with that or any other word, without a why or a wherefore, which appears to be the caſe, becauſe the word monarchy is obnoxious to the auricular organs of Mr. Paine, does it ne-

ceſſarily

ceſſarily follow, that the reſt of mankind, either is or ought to be ſimilarly affected? by no means; had the author of the Rights of Man poſſeſſed a grain of candour, inſtead of condemning monarchies in general, he would have diſcriminated betwixt an abſolute and limited monarchy, but he has ſtudiouſly avoided it, in order to ground his anathemas on the Engliſh government, which is founded on thoſe very principles of liberty, which that great politician, Tacitus, deſcribed, but queſtioned the accompliſhment of. And however Mr. Paine may conſider himſelf peculiarly qualified to define, or take upon him to refine upon the word conſtitution, I ſhall, in addition to what has been ſaid, introduce the language of a writer, who ſays, " The government of England is " formed on principles of liberty; and that " it's conſtitution is the work of a wiſe " and brave people, who, conſidering that " all power was derived from them, and was " to be ſubſervient to their happineſs, com- " mitted it into the hands of the three ſtates, " who were to be a mutual ſupport, and mu- " tual check to each other, and yet ſo ordered, " that the intereſt of each is beſt promoted,

" by

" by each confining itſelf within it's proper " bounds."

The King, who is inveſted with the higheſt prerogative, has all the honors, and all the ſplendor of Majeſty, and is only limited where power might become tyranny, and where he might be capable of injuring either himſelf or his people.

By this means, we reap all the advantages, without any of the evils of a monarchical goverment. Mr. Paine, in p. 44, attempts to miſlead the community, by aſſerting, that our notions of government are falſe; but becauſe he aſſumes a dictatorial authority, it does not follow, that his ſentiments deſerve credit; and I truſt, the well diſpoſed, inſtead of being attached to the principles of this republican zealot, will unanimouſly wiſh him to experience every mortification, that a fomenter of ſedition, who is an enemy to ſociety, merits. And though Mr. Paine has endeavoured to prepoſſeſs mankind in favor of his Utopian ſchemes of government, that his ſand-bank will be waſhed away, and a rock riſe upon it's ſcite; as Mr. Burke, in p. 241, announces his intention

intention to favor us with a compariſon betwixt the Engliſh and French conſtitutions. So charmed is Mr. Paine with the ſpirit of revolutions, that he cannot avoid offering up his prayers, that they may become univerſal: for in p. 60, he ſays, "Much is to be learned from the "Fench conſtitution. Conqueſt and tyranny "tranſplanted themſelves with William the "Conqueror into England, and the country "is yet disfigured with the marks. May the "example of all France, contribute to rege-"nerate the freedom, whom a province of it "deſtroyed." When one contemplates on this paſſage, and unites it with a famous toaſt given at the revolution meeting of 1789, namely, "May the Engliſh parliament become a na-"tional aſſembly," ſurely none can heſitate pronouncing ſuch perſons enemies to the eſtabliſhed government. Mr. Paine, in p. 60, takes upon him to declare, That every thing in the Engliſh government is the reverſe of what it ought to be, and what it is ſaid to be. This certainly is not a fact, and though well diſpoſed to controvert this aſſertion, ſhall defer ſo doing, as it would lead me into too extenſive a diſcuſſion at preſent.

In

In p. 117, this dogmatic republican ſays, " Notwithſtanding the nonſenſe, for it deſerves " no better name, that Mr. Burke has aſſerted " about hereditary right and hereditary ſucceſ- " ſion, and that a nation has not a right to " form a government for itſelf, it happened to " fall in his way to give ſome account of what " government is." " Government," ſays he, " is a contrivance of human wiſdom." As for the doctrine in queſtion, the inconveniences which this country has experienced for want of ſuch a regulation, has apparently ſo fully convinced mankind of the propriety of the meaſure, that their approbation thereof, appears rather the reſult of reaſon, than ſubmiſſion to a poſitive law. And why Mr. Paine ſhould be ſo outrageous againſt Mr. Burke for ſpeaking truth, in ſaying, " Government is a con- " trivance of human wiſdom," I cannot diſcover; for according to my conception, the idea which Mr. Burke means to convey ſeems very clear; that is, as much as if he had ſaid, That notwithſtanding our natural attachment to a lineal ſucceſſion, the community by means of their delegates, have not only full power to improve the conſtitution, but have enforced it.

it. Mr. Paine, in p. 118, ſays, " It is impoſ-
" ſible to make wiſdom hereditary, and that
" that cannot be a wiſe contrivance which in
" it's operation may commit the government
" of a nation to the wiſdom of a fool." Here the author of the Rights of Man ſoars on eagles wings, and holds out a ſpecious bait to entrap the unwary: but ſuppoſing for argument ſake, the Prince was an ideot, the conſequence would not be ſo alarming as Mr. Paine would perſuade us; for the legiſlature has in their wiſdom provided, and have full power to provide ſuch ſalutary laws, as reſtrains him from doing wrong, and renders him reſponſible thereto. If ſo, Mr. Paine is not only a libeller of government, but alſo the community at large, to ſupport which, I ſhall introduce the doctrine this political oracle holds forth, in p. 51, " When I contemplate the natural dignity of
" man; when I feel for the honour and hap-
" pineſs of its character; I become irritated
" at the attempt to govern mankind by force
" and fraud, as if they were all knaves and
" fools; and can ſcarcely avoid diſguſt at thoſe
" who are thus impoſed upon." And in p. 115, he ſays, " What are the preſent govern-

" ments

" ments of Europe, but a ſcene of iniquity " and oppreſſion?"

The arguments which Mr: Paine inſidiouſly adopts, and the concluſions he draws therefrom, are by no means applicable to the government of England: and although he cannot forgive Mr. Burke for his defence of hereditary right, I ſhould be glad to know what inconvenience it can be productive of, ſince it is ſapped of its poiſonous qualities by ſenatorial wiſdom. The King of England has the power of doing good in it's fulleſt extent, which is the only power that can give him true dignity and diſtinguiſhed honour; for it is not the leaſt diminution to his glory, that he is confined from doing what would tarniſh his reputation, and render him infamous to poſterity: on the contrary, this is a circumſtance that renders him truly great, and raiſes him above all the tyrants of the earth. To ſuch profeſſed republicans as the diſciples of Rouſſeau, Paine, and Price, deſirous of rendering them a ſervice, I ſeriouſly recommend to their attentive peruſal the Vth chapter of the IId book of De Lolme on the conſtitution, wherein their folly is exhibited

by

by demonſtrating their erroneous ideas of liberty. Monſ. De Lolme in chap. XV. book II. ſays, " If any thing is capable of conveying " to us an adequate idea of the ſoundneſs, as " well as peculiarity of the principles on which " the Engliſh government is founded, it is " the attentive peruſal of the ſyſtem of public " compacts to which the revolution of 1688 " gave riſe. Of the bill of rights, with all " it's different clauſes, and of the ſeveral acts " which under two ſubſequent reigns, till the " acceſſion of the houſe of Hanover, were " made in order to ſtrengthen it." And the ſame learned writer in his introduction, conſiders his being a foreigner rather a circumſtance in his favour, as his ſentiments cannot be ſuſpected to reſult from prejudice. " The En- " gliſh," ſays he, " having their eyes open as " I may ſay upon their liberty, from their " firſt entrance into life, are perhaps too much " familiarized with it's enjoyment, to enquire " with real concern into it's cauſes. Having " acquired practical notions of their govern- " ment long before they have meditated on it, " and theſe notions being ſlowly and gradually " imbibed, they at length behold it without " any degree of ſenſibility; and they ſeem to

" me in this reſpect, to be like the recluſe
" inhabitant of a palace, who is perhaps, in
" the worſt ſituation for attaining a complete
" idea of the whole, and never experienced
" the ſtriking effect of its external ſtructure
" and elevation: or, if you pleaſe, like a man,
" who, having always had a beautiful and ex-
" tenſive view before his eyes, views it with
" indifference."

Conſidering it time to bid adieu to Mr. Paine and his falſe principles, in hopes this humble effort may be inſtrumental in counteracting the ſpirit of ſedition, I ſhall cloſe with the admonitory language of St. Paul to the Romans (chap. xiii.); " Let every ſoul be
" ſubject unto the higher powers. For there
" is no power but of God: the powers that
" be, are ordained of God. Whoſoever there-
" fore reſiſteth the power, reſiſteth the ordi-
" nance of God: and they that reſiſt, ſhall
" receive to themſelves condemnation. For
" rulers are not a terror to good works, but to
" the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of
" the power? do that which is good, and thou
" ſhalt have praiſe of the ſame: for he is the
" miniſter of God to thee for good. But if

" thou

" thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for
" he beareth not the ſword in vain: for he is
" the miniſter of God, a revenger to execute
" wrath upon him that doth evil."

FINIS.

10 FE 58